

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner's first rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis, Jr. (US 4,607,411). The Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection, as noted below.

In the Lewis, Jr., prior art reference, the “plurality of bristles” are not attached to the bottom surface of the brush head, but rather, are attached to a side surface of the brush head. As a result, the Lewis, Jr., prior art reference functions differently than the present invention.

Therefore, applicant believes he has successfully traversed this basis for rejection.

Claims 2-3 are directly derivative of claim 1. As claims that are derivative of claims that are believed to be in condition for allowance, claims 2-3 also is in condition for allowance due to the fact that they contain all limitations inherent in the base claim. Therefore, applicant believes he has traversed this rejection as well for claims 2-3.

Examiner's second rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balch (US 206,212). The Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection, as noted below.

In the Balch prior art reference, the rubber blade is not attached to the top surface, but rather than bottom surface. As a result, the Balch prior art reference functions differently than the present invention. Therefore, applicant believes he has successfully traversed this basis for rejection.

Claims 2-3 are directly derivative of claim 1. As claims that are derivative of claims that are believed to be in condition for allowance, claims 2-3 also is in condition for allowance due to

the fact that they contain all limitations inherent in the base claim. Therefore, applicant believes he has traversed this rejection as well for claims 2-3.

Examiner's third rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Nierkerk (US 5,072,479) in view of Lambert (US 5,987,685). The Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection, as noted below.

Despite the fact that there is a rubber blade disclosed in the Van Nierkerk prior art reference, there is nothing disclosed in the Van Nierkerk prior art reference that discloses specifically where this blade is located. Therefore, applicant believes that this application, even in combination with the Lambert prior art reference, does not render the present invention “obvious” due to the lack of suggestability with regard to proper placement of the rubber blade.

Furthermore, in Lambert, the diagrams also suggest that the proper placement of the rubber blade is on the “bottom surface” of the brush head, not the top. This is said in full consideration of the fact that the brush head in Lambert appears to be rounded and not box-shaped. However, the location of the rubber blade in the Lambert prior art application is opposite that of the pole attachment location and not near it, as it is in the present invention.

Examiner's fourth rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Nierkerk (US 5,072,479) in view of Lambert (US 5,987,685), and further in view of Zimmerman (US 4,375,115). The Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection, as noted below.

Claim 2 is directly derivative of claim 1. As a claim that is derivative of a claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, claim 2 also is in condition for allowance due to the fact that it contains all limitations inherent in the base claim. Therefore, applicant believes he has traversed this rejection as well for claim 2.

Examiner's fifth rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Nierkerk (US 5,072,479) in view of Lambert (US 5,987,685), and further in view of Peck (US 2,722,705). The Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection, as noted below.

Claim 3 is directly derivative of claim 1. As a claim that is derivative of a claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, claim 3 also is in condition for allowance due to the fact that it contains all limitations inherent in the base claim. Therefore, applicant believes he has traversed this rejection as well for claim 3.

Examiner's sixth rejection:

The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marriott (US 1,255,902) in view of Van Nierkerk (US 5,072,479). The Applicant disagrees with this basis for rejection, as noted below.

In the Marriott prior art reference, the rubber blade is not attached to the top surface, but rather, to a side surface that is located near the top surface. The end result has the blade angling outward in a different position than the in the present invention. The Van Nierkerk prior art reference does not nothing to clarify the proper positioning of the rubber blade because it does nothing to clarify specifically where this blade is located. Therefore, applicant believes he has

successfully traversed this basis for rejection.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above-described reasons, applicant submits that the specifications and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims define patentability over the prior art. In addition, applicants believe that her arguments in the "Remarks" section successfully traverses the objections and rejections brought forth by the Examiner in the Office Action. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action she respectfully solicits. If the Examiner feels that some of the dependent claims are allowable, the Applicant asks the Examiner to allow the Applicant to make any amendments to the allowed claims to incorporate all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Respectfully Submitted,



Matthew J. Peirce, Esq.
Registration No. #41,245
Attorney for Inventor Emil Rudd